

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2004

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/719,448 11/21/2003 Fred H. Burbank R0367-01003 3039 7590 09/20/2004 **EXAMINER** Edward J. Lynch JEFFERY, JOHN A **DUANE MORRIS LLP** ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER One Market Spear Tower, Ste. 2000 3742 San Francisco, CA 94105

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			111
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/719,448	BURBANK ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John A. Jeffery	3742	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addr	ess
• •	LVIC OFT TO EVOIDE AM	IONTU(O) EDOM	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of third d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON ate, cause the application to become AE	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this common the mailing date of this common than the mailing date of the mailing da	munication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Th	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	ance except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the m	nerits is
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 31-60</u> is/are pending in the ap	oplication.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,31-37,40,42-50,53 and 55-60</u> is/a	re rejected.		
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>38,39,41,51,52 and 54</u> is/are object	ed to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2003 is	/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□] objected to by the Examin	er.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyar	ice. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ction is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR	1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO	-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) All b) Some * c) None of:			
 Certified copies of the priority documer 			
2. Certified copies of the priority documer			•
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri	· ·	received in this National St	age
application from the International Burea	` ','		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies not	received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s	s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-1	52)
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/21/03</u>. 	6) Other:		JZ)

Art Unit: 3742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/684,124. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Carter (US 4,863,470) or, alternatively, Sinaiko (US 3,341,417).

Carter discloses an X-ray detectable body 16 embedded in gelatin body 14. See Figs. 1 and 2 and col. 2, lines 32-33, col. 2, lines 47-48 and lines 59-63.

Also, Sinaiko discloses an X-ray detectable body embedded in a gelatin body. See (1) col. 2, lines 30-37 and 59-62, (2) col. 3, lines 53-65, and (3) col. 3, line 74 - col. 4, line 28.

Art Unit: 3742

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over (1) claims 1 and 23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,347,241 and (2) claims 1 and 13 of U.S Patent No. 6,662,041. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant application are merely broader in scope than the

Art Unit: 3742

patented claims. See In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Moreover, there is no apparent reason why applicant could not have presented the instant claim during prosecution of the '241 and '041 patents.

Claims 31-35, 42-48, and 55-60 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,347,241. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant application are merely broader in scope than the patented claims. *See In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Moreover, there is no apparent reason why applicant could not have presented the instant claims during prosecution of the '241 patent.

Claims 36 and 49 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,347,241 in view of Krag (US 6,363,940). The claims differ from the claims of the '241 patent in calling for the marker body to have a colorant therein. Krag (US 6,363,940) discloses a biopsy marker 30g comprising a gelatin capsule filled with a colored dye 78. The marker is also ultrasonically detectable. See col. 8, lines 30-53. In view of Krag, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a colorant within the marker of the patented claims to enhance detection.

Art Unit: 3742

Claims 36, 37, 40, and 42-50, 53, and 55-58 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 44-49 of copending Application No. 10/684,124. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant application are merely broader in scope than the patented claims. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 38, 39, 41, 51, 52, and 54 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John A. Jeffery whose telephone number is (703) 306-4601. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 7:00 AM to 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robin Evans, can be reached on (703) 305-5766. All faxes should be sent to the centralized fax number at (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for Application/Control Number: 10/719,448 Page 6

Art Unit: 3742

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

ŬJOHN A. JEFFERY PRIMARY EXAMINER

9/13/04